arXiv:1611.01904v1 [math.CO] 7 Nov 2016

On edge dimension of a graph

Nina Zubrilina

November 8, 2016

Abstract

Given a connected graph G, the edge dimension, denoted $\mathrm{edim}(G)$, is the least size of a set S that distinguishes every edge of G, in the sense that different edges have different tuples of distances to the elements of S. The notation was introduced by Kelenc, Tratnik, and Yero, and in their paper they asked several questions. In this article we answer two of these questions: on graphs of maximal edge dimension and on a conjectured upper bound of the ratio between $\mathrm{edim}(G)$ and $\dim(G)$ (here $\dim(G)$ is the standard metric dimension of G). We classify the graphs for which $\mathrm{edim}(G) = n - 1$ and show that $\frac{\mathrm{edim}(G)}{\dim(G)}$ isn't bounded from above. We also compute $\mathrm{edim}(G \square P_m)$ and $\mathrm{edim}(G + K_1)$.

1 Introduction

Let $G(V, E)$ be a simple unconnected graph. We define the distance between an edge $e = xy$ and vertex v as: $d(e, v) = min\{d(x, v), d(y, v)\}$. A vertex v *distinguishes* two edges e_1 and e_2 if $d(e_1, v) \neq d(e_2, v)$. A set $S \subset V$ is an *edge metric generator* of a graph $G(V, E)$ if for any two distinct edges e_1, $e_2 \in E$ there is a vertex $s \in S$ such that s distinguishes e_1 and e_2. An edge generating set with the smallest number of elements is called the *edge basis* of G, and the number of elements in the edge basis is the *edge dimension* of G ($\mathrm{edim}(G)$). Let $G(V, E)$ be a simple unconnected graph. We define the distance between an edge $e = xy$ and vertex v as: $d(e, v) = min\{d(x, v), d(y, v)\}$. A vertex v *distinguishes* two edges e_1 and e_2 if $d(e_1, v) \neq d(e_2, v)$. A set $S \subset V$ is an *edge metric generator* of a graph $G(V, E)$ if for any two distinct edges e_1, $e_2 \in E$ there is a vertex $s \in S$ such that s distinguishes e_1 and e_2. An edge

generating set with the smallest number of elements is called the *edge basis* of G, and the number of elements in the edge basis is the *edge dimension* of G (*denoted*edim(G)). This concept was introduced by Kelenc, Tratnik and Yero in [6] in analogy with the classical metric dimension dim(G).

We say a vertex v distinguishes $v_1, v_2 \in V$ if $d(v, v_1) \neq d(v, v_2)$. A set $S \subset V$ is a *vertex generating set* of a graph G if for any distinct $v_1, v_2 \in V$ there is a vertex $s \in S$ such that s distinguishes v_1 and v_2. A vertex generating set with the smallest number of elements is a *vertex basis* of G, and the number of elements in the basis is its *dimension* (denoted dim(G)).

Metric dimension was introduced by Slater in 1975 in [9], in connection with the problem of uniquely recognizing the location of an intruder in a network. The same concept was introduced independently by Harary and Melter in [4]. This graph invariant is helpful in areas such as robot navigation ([7]), chemistry ([2], [3], [5]) and problems of image processing and pattern recognition involving hierarchical data structures ([8]). Metric generators in graphs are also connected to coin weighing and the Mastermind game as discussed in [1].

Consider some vertex x of a graph. The *distance tuple* of x on $S \subset V$, $S = \{v_1, \ldots, v_k\}$ is the tuple

$$d_S(x) = (d(x, v_1), d(x, v_2), \ldots, d(x, v_k)).$$

It is easy to see that S is a vertex generator if and only if the distance tuples on S are different for all vertices of $V(E)$.

We define the distance tuple identically if x is an edge. Similarly, S is an edge generator if and only if the distance tuples on S are different for all edges of $V(E)$.

We use the notation $N(v)$ for vertices adjacent to v (not including v). We use $V(G)$ and $E(G)$ to denote the vertices and edges of a graph. We say diam$(G) = \max\{d(u, v) | u, v \in V(G)\}$ and denote the maximal degree of the vertices of G with $\Delta(G)$. We use notation $G_1 + G_2$ for the sum of graphs G_1, G_2, which is constructed by connecting all the vertices of G_1 with all the vertices of G_2. We use P_m to denote a path of length m and $G_1 \square G_2$ to denote the Cartesian product of G_1 and G_2. All the graphs are simple, connected and undirected.

In [6], Kelenc, Tratnic and Yero determine edim for various graphs, including paths, cycles, trees and grids. They give examples of graphs for which edim$(G) <$ dim(G) (wheel graphs), edim$(G) =$ dim(G) (trees) and

$\text{edim}(G) > \dim(G)$ ($C_{4r} \square C_{4t}$ for integers r, t). They show examples of graphs with $\frac{\text{edim}(G)}{\dim(G)} \approx 5/2$ and ask if the $\frac{\text{edim}(G)}{\dim(G)}$ ratio is bounded from above. They also ask for the classification of the graphs with $\text{edim}(G) = |V| - 1$. In this paper we answer both questions. We also calculate $\text{edim}(G \square P_m)$ and $\text{edim}(G + K_1)$.

2 Graphs for which edim $= |V| - 1$

For a graph $G(V, E)$ it is easy to see that if $|V| = n$, then edim $\leq n - 1$ as any $n - 1$ vertices form an edge generating set. We will now describe all the graphs for which edim $= n - 1$.

Definition 2.1. *We call the set* $(N(v_1) \cup N(v_2)) \setminus ((N(v_1) \cap N(v_2))$ *the* non-mutual neighbors *of* v_1 *and* v_2.

Theorem 2.2. *Let* $G(V, E)$ *be a graph with* $|V| = n$. *Then* $\text{edim}(G) = n - 1$ *if and only if for any distinct* $v_1, v_2 \in V$ *there exists* $u \in V$ *such that* $v_1u \in E, v_2u \in E$ *and* u *is adjacent to all non-mutual neighbors of* v_1, v_2.

Proof. Suppose $\text{edim}(G) = n - 1$. Then for any distinct $v_1, v_2 \in V$, the set $V \setminus \{v_1, v_2\}$ doesn't generate the edges of G. Fix some v_1 and v_2 and let $S = V \setminus \{v_1, v_2\}$. If S doesn't generate the edges of G, there must exist two edges that have the same distances to all elements of S.

Claim. *Let* $e_1 \neq e_2$ *and* $d_S(e_1) = d_S(e_2)$. *Then* $e_1 = v_1u$ *and* $e_2 = v_2u$ *for some* $u \in V$.

Proof of claim. Suppose there is a vertex v such that $v \neq v_1$, $v \neq v_2$ and v is on exactly one of the two edges e_1 and e_2. Then v distinguishes e_1 and e_2 since it has distance 0 to one of them and distance at least 1 to the other. Thus there can't be such a vertex. Notice e_1 and e_2 have at least 3 vertices in total. At most 2 of them are in $\{v_1, v_2\}$. At most one of them is mutual. Thus, the only case when there isn't such a vertex v is when $e_1 = v_1u$, $e_2 = v_2u$ for some $u \in V$. This proves the claim. □

Notice the claim restricts G to having $\text{diam}(G) \leq 2$, since we showed for any distinct $v_1, v_2 \in V$ there is a $u \in V$ such that $v_1u \in E$ and $v_2u \in E$. Thus, v_1u and v_2u have distances 1 or 2 to all vertices in $S \setminus \{u\}$. Consider a vertex $w \in S \setminus \{u\}$. Suppose $wv_1 \in E$. Then $d(e_1, w) = 1$ and $d(e_2, w) = d(e_1, w)$,

so we must have $uv_2 \in E$. The same holds if we switch v_1 and v_2. Thus u must be a neighbor of all non-mutual neighbors of v_1 and v_2.

We will now show that if $e_1 = v_1u$, $e_2 = v_2u$ and u is connected to all non-mutual neighbors of v_1 and v_2 then e_1 and e_2 are indistinguishable by all vertices of S. Suppose this holds for some v_1, v_2, u. Consider $w \in S$. If $w = u$, $d(e_1, w) = 0 = d(e_2, w)$. Otherwise, w has distance 1 or 2 to e_1 and e_2. Say $d(w, e_1) = 1$. There are two cases:

1. $d(w, u) = 1$. Then obviously $d(w, e_2) = 1$.

2. $d(w, v_1) = 1$, $d(w, u) \neq 1$. We know u has to be adjacent to all non-mutual neighbors of e_1 and e_2. We also know u is not adjacent to w. This means w can't be a non-mutual neighbor, so since w is adjacent to v_1, w also has to be adjacent to v_2. Thus $d(v_2, w) = 1$ and $d(e_2, w) = 1$.

This means that if one of the edges has distance 1 to w, then so does the other. Since we showed the distances from these edges to elements of $S \setminus \{u\}$ can only be 1 or 2, this proves that e_1 and e_2 are equidistant from all elements of S.

□

The next theorem is a simple consequence of Theorem 2.2.

Corollary 2.3. *Let G be a graph on n vertices. Suppose* $\operatorname{edim}(G) = n - 1$. *Then* $\operatorname{diam}(G) \leq 2$ *and every edge is in a cycle of length* 3.

Proof. Theorem 2.2 implies that for any $v_1 \neq v_2$ there is a $u \in V$ such that $v_1u \in E$ and $v_2u \in E$, so $\operatorname{diam}(G) \leq 2$. Moreover, for any $xy \in E$ there exists $u \in V$ such that $xu \in E$ and $yu \in E$. This means xy is in a cycle xuy of length 3. □

3 The $\operatorname{edim}(G)$ to $\dim(G)$ ratio

A natural question that arises in the study of the edge dimension is how it is related to the dimension of the same graph.

Question. *For what triples (x, y, n) does there exist a graph G with* $\dim(G) = x, \operatorname{edim}(G) = y$ *and $|V| = n$?*

Kelenc, Tratnik and Yero give examples of graphs for which $\dim(G) < \text{edim}(G)$, $\dim(G) = \text{edim}(G)$, and $\dim(G) > \text{edim}(G)$. Moreover, they show that there exist graphs realizing all triples (x, y, n) such that $1 < x \leq y \leq 2x \leq n - 2$.

One of the questions they ask is whether $\frac{\text{edim}(G)}{\dim(G)}$ is bounded from above. In this section we show it's not.

Theorem 3.1. *$\frac{\text{edim}(G)}{\dim(G)}$ is not bounded from above.*

We prove this theorem by finding a graph F_k with $\text{edim}(F_k) = k + 2^k - 2$, and $\dim(F_k) = k$.

We first define the graph F_k.

Definition 3.2. *For a positive integer k, let F_k be the graph on vertex set $A \cup B$, where $B = \{b_1 \dots b_k\}$ and $A = \{a_S | S \subset B\}$. Let b_i, b_j be adjacent for all $b_i, b_j \in B$ and $b_i \neq b_j$, and let a_S, a_T be adjacent for all $a_S, a_T \in A$ and $a_S \neq a_T$. For any $b_i \in B, a_S \in A$ let b_i, a_S be adjacent if and only if $i \in S$.*

Notice $|V(F_k)| = k + 2^k$.

Before determining some properties of F_k, we need the following results.

Lemma 3.3 ([2])**.** *Let G(V, E) be a graph with diameter D and $\dim(G) = k$. Then $|V| \leq k + D^k$.*

Proof. We will prove this lemma to demonstrate the motivation for the construction of F_k.

Let $B = \{b_1, \dots, b_k\}$ be a vertex basis for F_k and $V = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ be the vertices. Consider the distance tuples $d_B(v_i)$ for all $v_i \in V$. There are k basis vertex tuples with exactly one 0 in them, and all others tuples consist of k numbers from 1 to D. This shows there can be no more than $k + D^k$ different distance tuples. But the distance tuples have to be different for all vertices in order for B to be a vertex basis. Thus, there can be no more than $k + D^k$ vertices. □

Lemma 3.4 ([6])**.** *Let $G(V, E)$ be a graph with $|V| = n$ and $\Delta(G) = n - 1$. Then $\text{edim}(G)$ is either $n - 1$ or $n - 2$.*

Lemma 3.5 ([6])**.** *Let $G(V, E)$ be a graph with $|V| = n$ and $\Delta(G) = n - 1$. Suppose there are at least two vertices with degree $n - 1$. Then $\text{edim}(G) = n - 1$.*

Theorem 3.6. *For any positive integer k,* $\dim(F_k) = k$ *and* $\operatorname{edim}(F_k) = k + 2^k - 2$.

Proof. Since $a_B = a_{\{b_1 \ldots b_k\}}$ is connected to all the other vertices of F_k, we have $\operatorname{diam}(F_k) = 2$. Because $|V(F_k)| = k + 2^k$, Lemma 3.3 guarantees $\dim(F_k) \geq k$. Moreover, B is a vertex generating set since the distance tuples d_B are different for all elements of $V(F_k)$ (this follows immediately from construction of F_k). Thus, $\dim(F_k) = k$.

Notice a_B is connected to every vertex of F_k by construction, so by Lemma 3.4 we know $\operatorname{edim}(F_k)$ is either $|V(F_k)| - 1$ or $|V(F_k)| - 2$. Consider the vertices $a_\emptyset$ and a_B. By construction of F_k we know $a_\emptyset$ is not connected to any elements of B, and a_B is connected to all of them. This means all elements of B are non-mutual connections of $a_\emptyset$ and a_B. Also, notice that a_B is the only vertex adjacent to all elements of B. This shows the condition of Theorem 2.2 doesn't hold for F_k, so $\operatorname{edim}(F_k) = |V(F_k)| - 2 = k + 2^k - 2$. □

As we can see, the constructed graph F_k proves the claim of our theorem.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Follows from Theorem 3.6. □

Another related question we could ask is: given that $\operatorname{edim}(G) = n - 1$, how large can $\dim(G)$ be? Consider the following example.

Definition 3.7. $H_k = F_k + \{t\}$ *for some vertex* t.

We will preserve the notation for the vertices of the subgraph F_k of H_k.

Theorem 3.8. *For any positive integer k,* $\dim(H_k) = k + 1$, $\operatorname{edim}(H_k) = k + 2^k = n - 1$.

Proof. Due to Lemma 3.3, $\dim(H_k) \geq k + 1$. Notice that $B \cup \{t\}$ is a vertex generating set. Indeed, consider any two vertices x and $y \in V(H_k)$. If one of them (say, x) is in $B \cup \{t\}$, then x distinguishes x and y. Otherwise, both x and y are in A. All elements of A have different distance tuples on B with $1's$ and $2's$ in all the tuples. Notice that distance tuples of A on B are the same in H_k as in F_k, since any "path" from $a \in A$ to $b \in B$ going through t will have length at least 2 and thus cannot be shorter then $d(a, b)$ in F_k. Thus, all pairs of elements are distinguished by elements of B, and $B \cup \{t\}$ is a vertex generation set. This means $\dim(H) = k + 1$.

In H_k, a_B and t are connected to all the other vertices, so by Lemma 3.3, $\operatorname{edim}(H_k) = |V(H_k)| - 1 = k + 2^k$.

□

While we do not know graphs with $\text{edim}(G)$ much larger than $\dim(G) + 2^{\dim(G)}$, it follows from Lemma 3.3 that this is the sharpest ratio we can achieve for graphs of diameter 2. Since we know graphs $G(V, E)$ with edge dimension $n - 1$ have to have diameter 2, this means we cannot further increase the dimension if we want the edge dimension to be maximal (namely $n - 1$).

We also prove an analogue of Lemma 3.3 for edge dimension.

Theorem 3.9. *Let $G(V, E)$ be a simple connected graph with diameter D, $|V| = n$, and $\text{edim}(G) = k$. Then $|E| \leq \binom{k}{2} + kD^{k-1} + D^k$*

Proof. Let S be an edge basis. Consider the distance tuples for all elements of E. There are at most $\binom{k}{2}$ distance tuples with two zeros (edges between pairs of elements of S), kD^{k-1} elements with one zero (k ways to choose the position of the zero, D^{k-1} options for the remaining places), and at most D^k tuples with no zeros. Thus, since the tuples have to be different for all elements of E, we have $|E| \leq \binom{k}{2} + kD^{k-1} + D^k$. □

4 edim for $G + K_1$ and $G \square P_m$

In this section we characterize how the edge dimension changes upon taking a Cartesian product with a path, or upon adding a vertex adjacent to all others.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $G(V, E)$ be a graph with $|V| = n$. Suppose for any vertex $x \in V$ there is another vertex $u \in V$ such that $V \setminus N(x) \subset N(u)$. Then $\text{edim}(G + K_1) = n$. Otherwise, $\text{edim}(G + K_1) = n - 1$.*

Proof. Denote the K_1 graph vertex t. Since t is connected to all vertices of $G + K_1$, by Lemma 3.4 $\text{edim}(G + K_1)$ is either n or $n - 1$. We will use Theorem 2.2 to see when each case holds. Consider $x, y \in V$. Whatever their non-mutual connections are, t is connected to all of them and to x and y, so the hypothesis holds for this vertex pair. Now consider a pair t and $x \in V$. Their non-mutual connections are exactly $V \setminus N(x) \cup \{x\}$. This means the condition holds for x, t if and only if there exists $u \in V$ such that $V \setminus N(x) \subset N(u)$. Thus $\text{edim}(G + K_1) = n$ if and only if the condition holds for any pair of vertices of $G + K_1$, which gives us the statement of the theorem. □

We denote the Cartesian product of graphs G and H with $G\Box H$.

Theorem 4.2. *Let G be a graph and P_m a path of length $m \geq 2$. Let C be the set of all edge bases of G, let D be the set of all vertex bases of G. Let M be an element of the smallest cardinality in the sets $\left\{ S \cup T \middle| S \in C, T \in D \right\}$. Then: $|M| \leq \operatorname{edim}(G\Box P_m) \leq |M| + 1$.*

Proof. The graph $G\Box P_m$ can be constructed the following way: First, take m copies of G. Denote the i^{th} copy of G with $G(i)$. Denote the vertices of $G(i)$ by $v(i)$, where $v \in V(G)$. Then, connect $v(i)$ with $v(i+1)$ for all $v \in V(G)$, $i \in \{1, \ldots, m-1\}$.

Lower bound: Suppose B is an edge basis of $G\Box P_m$. Let B_1 be the projection of B on $G(1)$ (where we "project" $v(i)$ to $v(1)$).

Consider $e \in E(G(1))$. Notice that $d(e, v(i)) = d(e, v(1)) + i - 1$. Thus, $e_1, e_2 \in E(G(1))$ are distinguished by $v(1)$ if and only if they are distinguished by $v(i)$. Thus, if B is an edge generating set of $G\Box P_m$, then B_1 is an edge generating set of G.

Consider an edge $e = v(1)v(2)$. Notice that for $i \geq 2$ we have $d(e, w(i)) = d(v(2), w(2)) + (i-2) = d(v(1), w(1)) + (i-2)$, and for $i = 1$, $d(e, w(i)) = d(v(1), w(1))$. These differ by a constant only dependent on i. This means that if we consider two edges $x = v(1)v(2)$ and $y = u(1)u(2)$, then $w(i)$ distinguishes x and y if and only if $w(1)$ distinguishes x and y. Moreover, $w(1)$ distinguishes x and y if and only if $w(1)$ distinguishes $v(1)$ and $u(1)$. Thus, B_1 is a vertex generating set of $G(1)$ as well. This shows that B_1 is both an edge generating set and a vertex generating set, so $|B_1| \geq |M|$. Also, clearly, $|B_1| \leq |B|$. This gives us the lower bound.

Upper bound: Let $M(1)$ be a set defined in the statement of the theorem on $G(1)$ and let $t \in M$. Set $B = \{M(1) \bigcup t(m)\}$. We will prove B is an edge generating set of $G\Box P_m$. There are five cases of pairs of edges.

1. $e(i), f(i) \in E(G(i))$.

   By definition of M, some $v \in M$ distinguishes $e(1), f(1)$. Since

   $$d(v, z(i)) = d(v, z(1)) + i - 1 \text{ for any } z \in E(G),$$

   v also distinguishes $e(i)$ and $f(i)$.

2. $x(i)x(i+1)$; $y(i)y(i+1)$ for $x, y \in V$.

   By definition of M, some $v \in M$ distinguishes $x(1), y(1)$. Since

   $$d(v, z(i)) = d(v, z(1)) + i - 1 \text{ for any } z \in V(G),$$

   v also distinguishes $x(i)$ and $y(i)$. Thus

   $$d(v, x(i)x(i+1)) = d(v, x(i)) \neq d(v, y(i)y(i+1)) = d(v, y(i)).$$

3. $x(i)x(i+1)$, $y(j)y(j+1)$ for $x, y \in V$ $i \neq j$.

   Notice that

   $$d(x(i)x(i+1), t(1)) = d(x(1), t(1)) + i - 1$$

   and

   $$d((x(i)x(i+1)), t(m)) = d(x(n), t(m)+n-i-1 = d(x(1), t(1)+n-i-1,$$

   so

   $$d(x(i)x(i+1), t(1)) = d(x(i)x(i+1), t(m)) - 2i.$$

   Thus, since we assumed $i \neq j$, if $t(1)$ doesn't distinguish $x(i)x(i+1)$ and $y(j)y(j+1)$, then $t(m)$ does.

4. $e(i), f(j)$ for $e, w \in E(G)$, $i \neq j$.

   Similarly to case 3, we can see

   $$d(e(i), t(1)) = i - 1 + d(e(1), t(1)),$$

   and

   $$d(e(i), t(m)) = n-i+d(e(n), t(m)) = n-i+d(e(1), t(1)) = d(e(i)), t(1))-2i+1.$$

   Thus, if $t(1)$ does not distinguish $e(1)$ and $f(j)$, then $t(m)$ does.

5. $e(i)$, $y(j)y(j+1)$ for $e \in E(G)$, $y \in V(G)$.

   Let

   $$d(e(i), t(1)) = d(y(j)y(j+1), t(1)) = d.$$

   As we have shown, then

   $$d(e(i), t(m)) = d - 2i + 1 \text{ and } d(y(j)y(j+1), t(m)) = d - 2j.$$

   These can not be equal since they have different parity.

Since $|B| = |M| + 1$, this concludes the proof. □

5 Conclusion and Open Problems

We have shown $\frac{\text{edim}(G)}{\dim(G)}$ isn't bounded from above in section 3. More questions can be asked about the relationship between the two. For example,

- Are there graphs G for which $\text{edim}(G)$ much larger than $2^{\dim(G)}$?
- For what triples x, y, n does there exist a graph G with $|V| = n$, $\dim(G) = x$ and $\text{edim}(G) = y$?

Another approach that could be taken to understand how $\dim(G)$ and $\text{edim}(G)$ compare to each other is deriving some more properties of edim analogues to the known properties of dim, as we did in the last sections 2 and 4. For example, we could pose the following problems:

- For which graphs $G(V, E)$ is $\text{edim}(G) = |V| - 2$?
- For which graphs $G(V, E)$ is $\text{edim}(G) = 2$?
- For a graph G and a positive integer n, bound $\text{edim}(G \square C_n)$ in terms of some function of G.
- For graphs G_1, G_2, bound $\text{edim}(G_1 \square G_2)$ in terms of some function of G_1 and G_2.

6 Acknowledgments

The research was conducted during the Undergraduate Mathematics Research Program at University of Minnesota Duluth, and supported by grants NSF-1358659 and NSA H98230-16-1-0026. I would like to thank Joe Gallian for creating a marvelous working environment and for all his support and encouragements throughout the program. I would also like to thank Eric Riedl, Matthew Brennan and Levent Alpoge for very useful commentary and remarks.

References

[1] José Cáceres, Carmen Hernando, Merce Mora, Ignacio M. Pelayo, María L. Puertas, Carlos Seara, and David R. Wood. On the metric dimension of cartesian products of graphs. *SIAM Discrete Math.*, 21(2):423–441, 2007.

[2] Gary Chartrand, Linda Eroh, Mark A. Johnson, and Ortrud R. Oellermann. Resolvability in graphs and the metric dimension of a graph. *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 105(1):99–113, 2000.

[3] Gary Chartrand, Christopher Poisson, and Ping Zhang. Resolvability and the upper dimension of graphs. *Comput. Math. with Appl.*, 39(12):19–28, 2000.

[4] Frank Harary and R. A. Melter. On the metric dimension of a graph. *Ars Combin.*, 2(191-195):1, 1976.

[5] Mark Johnson. Structure-activity maps for visualizing the graph variables arising in drug design. *Biopharmaceutical Stat.*, 3(2):203–236, 1993.

[6] A. Kelenc, N. Tratnik, and I. G. Yero. Uniquely identifying the edges of a graph: the edge metric dimension. *ArXiv e-prints*, jan 2016.

[7] Samir Khuller, Balaji Raghavachari, and Azriel Rosenfeld. Landmarks in graphs. *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 70(3):217–229, 1996.

[8] Robert A Melter and Ioan Tomescu. Metric bases in digital geometry. *Comput. Vision, Graphics, Image Process.*, 25(1):113–121, 1984.

[9] Peter J Slater. Leaves of trees. *Congr. Numer.*, 14(549-559):37, 1975.